

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ITV Studios Limited v. Luc Thi Bich Huyen
Case No. D2026-2099

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ITV Studios Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Luc Thi Bich Huyen, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <loveislandbeyondthevilla.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on the same date.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of ITV plc (“ITV”). The Complainant is a media company that jointly owns the “Love Island” television format and brand, including its various spin-offs, including “Love Island: Beyond The Villa” with WPP Media Motion Entertainment Ltd.

“Love Island” is a global reality television format that was initially launched in the UK in 2005. Since the show’s relaunch in 2015, the “Love Island” brand has expanded into a global brand, being commissioned in more than 20 countries. In 2025, the Complainant launched “Love Island: Beyond the Villa” in the United States of America (“US”) – a “Love Island USA” spin-off reality television show following the lives of contestants after they had participated in “Love Island USA”.

Alongside the “Love Island” television programs, the Complainant operates an extensive merchandising and licensing program, leveraging the ‘Love Island’ brand through a diverse range of licensed merchandise, including apparel, cosmetics, drinkware, and accessories. These products are distributed through a network of ITV-owned e-commerce platforms and authorized third-party retail partners.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LOVE ISLAND, including:

- UK registration No. UK00003499107 registered on September 18, 2020, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 35, 38, and 41;
- US registration No. 6166959 registered on October 6, 2020, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 38, and 41; and
- European Union registration No. 018094312 registered on January 30, 2020, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 24, 25, 28, 38, and 41.

Additionally, the Complainant holds a registered trademark for BEYOND THE VILLA in the UK under registration No. UK00004309875, registered on March 20, 2026, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, and 41 with a corresponding application currently pending in the US.

The Complainant has registered an extensive portfolio of domain names that contains the trademark LOVE ISLAND alongside various brand-related terms such as <theloveislandshop.com> and <loveislandclothing.com> and, the portfolio specifically includes registrations featuring the full LOVE ISLAND and/or BEYOND THE VILLA marks including such as <loveislandbeyondthevilla.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 15, 2025. When the Complaint was filed the disputed domain name resolved to a website that purportedly offered for sale various merchandise using the Complainant’s marks and product images, under the title “LOVE ISLAND BEYOND THE VILLA MERCHANDISE STORE”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LOVE ISLAND and BEYOND THE VILLA marks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a party which is related to, or has any authorization to use or register the Complainant's trademarks, and considering the longstanding presence and widespread use of the LOVE ISLAND and BEYOND THE VILLA trademarks, it can be assumed that the Respondent has no previous rights and/or any fair interest or bona fide intentions in relation with the disputed domain name.

The Complainant finally contends that that the disputed domain name has been registered and is used with the sole purpose of taking advantage of the Complainant's reputation and the significant goodwill associated with the LOVE ISLAND and BEYOND THE VILLA trademarks. Given the global fame of the "Love Island" brand and the specific niche of the "Beyond the Villa" brand, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, by explicitly styling the website as the "OFFICIAL Merchandise Store" the Respondent is not merely participating in a fan community but is actively impersonating the Complainant or its authorized licensees, which constitutes a deliberate attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation of the site.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable and on the basis of the statements and documents submitted by the Parties.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements are satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the burden of proving that all these elements are present lies with the Complainant. At the same time, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, the Rules, or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences there from as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks and service marks LOVE ISLAND and BEYOND THE VILLA for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the marks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel thus notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s product name and official domain name (i.e., <loveislandbeyondthevilla.com>), consisting of the Complainant’s LOVE ISLAND and BEYOND THE VILLA marks in their entirety. Coupled with its use which is to host an e-commerce platform purportedly offering merchandise under the Complainant’s brand and using the Complainant’s marks without authorization, and by falsely presenting itself as the official merchandise store, the composition of the disputed domain name cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

Furthermore the Panel finds that the Respondent cannot be considered as making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus having a legitimate interest in the disputed domain name as a reseller as the website under the disputed domain name does not disclose the Respondent’s lack of relationship with the Complainant; on the contrary, it falsely suggests that it is the official store of the Complainant.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name for hosting a website which, inter alia by reproducing the Complainant’s trademarks and product images, gives Internet users the impression that the website is an official website of the Complainant or its licensee and that the Respondent is an authorised reseller of the Complainant’s products. This is not the case, and the Panel therefore finds that the Respondent by registering and using the disputed domain name intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website as per paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Noting that the disputed domain name (identical to the Complainant’s <loveislandbeyondthevilla.com> domain name) incorporates the Complainant’s registered trademarks, that no response has been filed, and that there appears to be no conceivable good faith use that could be made by the Respondent of the

disputed domain name, and considering all the facts and evidence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <loveislandbeyondthevilla.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: June 27, 2026